

HOWARD & HOWARD ATTORNEYS PLLC
 3800 Howard Hughes Pkwy., Suite 1000
 Las Vegas, NV 89169
 (702) 257-1483

1 **HOWARD & HOWARD ATTORNEYS PLLC**
 2 Robert Hernquist (Nevada Bar No. 10616)
 3 Wells Fargo Tower, Suite 1000
 4 3800 Howard Hughes Parkway
 5 Las Vegas, Nevada 89169-5980
 6 Telephone: (702) 257-1483 | Facsimile: (702) 567-1568
 7 Email: RHernquist@HowardandHoward.com

8
 9 **HOWARD & HOWARD ATTORNEYS PLLC**
 10 Patrick M. McCarthy (Michigan Bar No. P49100) (admitted *pro hac vice*)
 11 One North Main Building, Suite 410
 12 101 North Main Street
 13 Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104-1475
 14 Telephone: (734) 222-1483 | Fax: (734) 761-5957
 15 Email: PMcCarthy@HowardandHoward.com

16
 17 **HOWARD & HOWARD ATTORNEYS PLLC**
 18 Kristopher K. Hullibarger (Michigan Bar No. P66903) (admitted *pro hac vice*)
 19 450 West Fourth Street
 20 Royal Oak, Michigan 48067-2557
 21 Telephone: (248) 723-0453 | Fax: (248) 645-1568
 22 Email: kkh@h2law.com

23 *Attorneys for Plaintiff Konami Gaming, Inc*

24 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
 25 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

26
 27 KONAMI GAMING, INC., a Nevada
 28 corporation,

29 Plaintiff,

30 v.

31
 32 PTT, LLC d/b/a High 5 Games, a Delaware
 33 limited liability company,

34 Defendant.

35
 36 PTT, LLC d/b/a High 5 Games, a Delaware
 37 limited liability company,

38 Counterclaim-Plaintiff,

39 v.

40
 41 KONAMI GAMING, INC., a Nevada

42 Case No. 2:14-CV-01483-RFB-NJK

43
 44 **SECOND AMENDED JOINT**
 45 **STIPULATED DISCOVERY PLAN AND**
 46 **SCHEDULING ORDER**

47
 48 As amended on
 49 Page 8.

1 corporation,
2 Counterclaim-Defendant.

3 Pursuant to Rule 26(f) of the Federal Rules of Civil procedure and Local Rule 26-1,
4 Plaintiff Konami Gaming, Inc. (“Konami” or “Plaintiff”) and Defendant PTT, LLC d/b/a High
5 Games (“High 5 Games”) previously submitted a Joint Stipulated Discovery Plan and
6 Scheduling Order on March 13, 2015 (Dkt No. 25). On September 18, 2015, this Court
7 granted Plaintiff Konami Gaming, Inc. (“Konami” or “Plaintiff”) and Defendant PTT, LLC
8 d/b/a High 5 Games (“High 5 Games”) Stipulation to Stay Discovery and Claim Construction
9 Deadlines (Dkt No. 43) and Ordered that an Amended Joint Discovery Plan containing the
10 deadlines granted in the Stipulation be filed no later than September 22, 2015. Pursuant to
11 that Order, the Parties submitted an Amended Joint Discovery Plan and Scheduling Order that
12 was granted on September 23, 2015. (Dkt 46). The parties further agree to extend the stay
13 period for an additional seventy (70) days and to adjust other scheduling dates accordingly in
14 order to conduct a technical review meeting and to facilitate discussions that may assist with
15 resolution of this matter. The Parties hereby submit this Second Amended Joint Discovery
16 Plan and Scheduling Order.

17 This is a complex patent case involving Plaintiff’s allegations of infringement of four
18 patents. The Plaintiff has asserted a total of 64 claims against 63 of defendant High 5’s
19 games. The parties have exchanged initial contentions in accordance with the Joint Discovery
20 Plan and Scheduling Order set forth in this case. (Dkt. No. 32). During the contention
21 exchange plaintiff Konami served Initial Infringement Contentions (44 pages with claim
22 charts), followed by High 5’s Initial Non-Infringement, Invalidity and Unenforceability
23 Contentions (489 pages with claim charts), and finally, Konami served its Response to High
24 5’s contentions (834 pages with claim charts). The Parties are amending the Discovery Plan
25
26
27
28

1 and Scheduling Order in order to exchange further information about the accused technology,
2 and to permit the parties technical representatives to meet and discuss the technology, with the
3 intention of potentially reducing the issues and complexities in this dispute.
4

5 As this is a complex patent infringement action, a *Markman* hearing is required to
6 construe the claims in the patent(s) asserted in the action. The Court's *Markman* ruling to
7 come will be critical to the scope of discovery performed in this matter, such as, for example,
8 determining the scope of product(s) accused of infringement and related issues such as
9 damages by reason of their distribution in the marketplace. As a result, the Parties previously
10 requested Special Scheduling under the Local Rules to trigger certain discovery deadlines
11 based on entry of the Court's claim construction order, the timing of which the Parties and the
12 Court cannot determine at this time. The Special Scheduling Review was therefore made in
13 good faith and for purposes of litigating the case in the most expeditious and cost-effective
14 manner for the Court and all parties. The Proposed Discovery Plan and Scheduling Order
15 along with this Revised Discovery Plan and Scheduling Order are similar to other orders
16 entered by the Court in this District. *See, e.g.*, Scheduling Order granting Proposed Discovery
17 Plan/Scheduling Order dated 1/27/2015 (Dkt No. 31) in *Konami Gaming, Inc. v. Marks*
18 *Studios, LLC*, Case Number: 2:14-cv-01485-JAD-CWH; and Scheduling Order granting
19 Proposed Discovery Plan/Scheduling Order dated 08/04/2014 (Dkt. No. 18) in *Konami*
20 *Gaming, Inc. v. Lightning Gaming, Inc. et al.*, Case Number 2:14-cv-00724-JAD-CWH; and
21 Joint Proposed Discovery Plan and Scheduling Order dated 3/11/2015 (Dkt. 19) in *Galaxy*
22 *Gaming, Inc. v. In Bet Gaming, Inc., et al.*, Case Number: 2:14-cv-01956-RFB-VCF.
23

24 **I. COMPLIANCE WITH LOCAL RULE 26-1(D); STATEMENT REGARDING
25 SPECIAL SCHEDULING REVIEW, INCLUSIVE OF NATURE OF PARTIES'
26 CLAIMS AND DEFENSES**

1 Plaintiff and Defendant, through their attorneys of record, held their conference
2 pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(f) on February 19, 2015. The parties request special scheduling
3 in the form of a discovery period that is longer than the 180-day discovery period provided for
4 under the Local Rules. The parties respectfully submit that the extended time period is
5 appropriate because this is a patent case with discovery that is more time consuming than in
6 other matters. This case involves claims by Plaintiff that Defendant infringes four patents
7 owned by Konami - U.S. Patent No. 8,096,869 (the ‘869 patent), entitled “Gaming Machines
8 with Runs of Consecutive Identical Symbols,” U.S. Patent No. 8,366,540 (the ‘540 patent),
9 entitled “Gaming Machines with Runs of Consecutive Identical Symbols,” U.S. Patent No.
10 8,622,810 (the ‘810 patent), entitled “Gaming Machines with Replacement of Runs of
11 Symbols Containing Identical Symbols with New Identical Symbols,” and U.S. Patent No.
12 8,616,955 (the ‘955 patent), entitled “Gaming Machine with Runs of Symbols Populated with
13 Identical Symbols During Spinning of Reels,” (collectively, the “Patents-in-Suit”).
14 Defendant, in turn, denies infringement and challenges the validity of the Patents and has
15 counterclaimed for a declaration of non-infringement and invalidity of the Patents-in-Suit.
16 Written and deposition discovery will be needed, for example, the research, design and
17 development of the products accused of infringement, various pieces of prior art that may be
18 part of Defendant’s invalidity positions (including discovery outside of the United States), the
19 prosecution of the Patents-in-Suit, the proper construction of limitations of the asserted claims
20 of the Patents-in-Suit, and Defendant’s sales and revenues relating to the accused products.
21 Moreover, the Court’s *Markman* ruling will decide the meaning and scope of the patent
22 claims, which further may lead to additional fact discovery, and it will inform expert
23 discovery. As a result, the parties have agreed and ask that fact and expert discovery be
24 phased, such that fact discovery closes one hundred-twenty (120) days after entry of the
25
26
27
28

Court's claim construction order, and expert discovery closes ninety days (90) after the close of fact discovery. This will allow the parties to quickly complete any necessary discovery after the claim construction order, and will simplify and focus the remaining discovery, as well as any summary judgment motions and the Pretrial Order. The Parties further request a modification of the *Markman* schedule from the Local Rules 16.1-6 to 16.1-18 and believe there is good cause to do so. Plaintiff asserts four (4) patents and Defendant has counterclaimed for a declaration of non-infringement and invalidity of the Patents-in-Suit, which cause this matter to be complex. As stated above, most of this case hinges upon the proper construction of limitations of the asserted claims of the Patents-in-Suit as determined by this Court's *Markman* ruling. The special scheduling review is made in good faith and for purposes of litigating the case in the most expeditious and cost-effective manner for the Court and all parties.

II. DISCOVERY PLAN

A. Initial Disclosures

The parties exchanged initial disclosures pursuant to Rule 26(a)(1) on April 27, 2015.

B. Proposed Schedule

(i) **The parties propose the following schedule:**

Event	Basis	Proposed Date ¹
Deadline for Plaintiff to file Amended Complaint		February 29, 2016
Deadline for Defendant to file Amended Answer to Counterclaim		March 14, 2016

¹ The Parties note that the granted Stipulation (Dkt No. 43) stayed discovery deadlines, including Plaintiff's deadline to respond to outstanding discovery requests. The Parties will negotiate and agree to a revised deadline to respond to all such outstanding discovery requests upon conclusion of the stay.

1	Parties to file proposed protective order	14 days after Initial Scheduling Conference. LR 16.1-4.	Previously submitted on April 27, 2015
2	Last day to amend pleadings or add parties	90 days prior to the close of discovery	TBD
3	Initial expert disclosures	45 days after a <i>Markman</i> order on claim construction.	TBD
4	Rebuttal expert exchange	30 days after initial expert disclosures. LR 26-1(e)(3).	TBD
5	Submission of Joint Interim Status Report	60 days before discovery cut-off. LR 26-3.	TBD
6	Fact discovery cut-off	120 days after entry of the Court's claim construction order.	TBD
7	Expert discovery cut-off	90 days after the fact discovery cut off.	TBD
8	Last day to file dispositive motions	30 days after the expert discovery cut-off. LR 26-1(e)(4).	TBD
9	File pre-trial order	30 days after dispositive motion cut-off. LR 26-1(e)(5).	TBD ²

16

17 **C. Electronic Discovery**

18 Issues regarding disclosure or discovery of electronically stored information and forms
 19 in which it is produced: The parties agree that all documents produced in this action will be
 20 exchanged electronically in an electronically searchable format (i.e., with OCR information).
 21
 22 In addition, the following must be produced for each document other than documents in
 23 native format:

24 a) Single-page TIFF images; or multiple page PDF files;

25

26

27

28 ² In the event dispositive motions are filed, this date shall be suspended until 30 days after decision on those motions or further order of the Court (LR 26-1(e)(5)). The disclosures required by FRCP 26(a)(3) and objections thereto shall be included in pre-trial order.

1 b) Image base load files for IPRO (*.LFP), OPTICON (*.OPT or *.LOG), or
 2 SUMMATION (*dii). These load files shall also depict the documents boundaries, and IPRO
 3 and Summation must also depict attachment relationships; and

4 c) Data load files that are compatible with Concordance (*.DAT) or Summation
 5 (*dii) or are in a similarly delineated format.

6 Alternatively, a party may provide some documents or information in native format
 7 with an associated production number. Each party reserves its right to assert any appropriate
 8 objections to a request for production of documents in native format. If a party elects to
 9 produce documents in native format, the parties shall confer to reach an agreement regarding
 10 what, if any, associated metadata shall be produced.

11 **D. Discovery Limitations**

12 The parties have no proposed changes to the normal limitations on discovery
 13 according to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

14 **E. *Markman* Schedule**

15 The parties anticipate the need for a *Markman* schedule and hearing. The proposed
 16 dates for such a hearing pursuant to Local rules 16.1-6 to 16.1-18 are below:

Event	Basis	Proposed Date
Disclosure of Asserted Claims and Infringement Contentions (Amended)	LR 16.1-6	February 29, 2016
Initial Disclosure of Non-Infringement, Invalidity and Unenforceability Contentions (Amended)	LR 16.1-8	April 14, 2016
Response to Initial Non-Infringement, Invalidity and Unenforceability Contentions (Amended)	LR 16.1-10	April 28, 2016
Exchange of Proposed Terms for Claim Construction	LR 16.1-13	May 30, 2016

1	Exchange of Preliminary Claim Construction and Extrinsic Evidence	LR 16.1-14	August 29, 2016
3	Parties to Meet and Confer regarding terms requiring construction and proposed meaning of the terms	LR 16.1-14	September 5 – September 9, 2016
5	Joint Claim Construction Statement	LR 16.1-15	September 16, 2016
7	Opening Claim Construction Brief	LR 16.1-16	October 7, 2016
9	Responsive Claim Construction Brief	LR 16.1-16	October 21, 2016
10	Reply Claim Construction Brief	LR 16.1-16	October 28, 2016


11 **F. Estimated Time for Trial**

12 Because this is a patent case involving four patents, the parties estimate a 10 day jury
13 trial following voir dire.

14 The parties are ordered to submit a stipulation with calendar dates for all deadlines
15 listed as TBD on page 6 of this scheduling order, no later than 14 days after the Court's
16 issuance of the claim construction order.

17 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

18 November 12, 2015
19 Dated: _____



20
21
22
23 **NANCY J. KOPPE**
24 United States Magistrate Judge
25
26
27
28

HOWARD & HOWARD ATTORNEYS PLLC
3800 Howard Hughes Pkwy., Suite 1000
Las Vegas, NV 89169
(702) 257-1483

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 Dated this 9th day of November , 2015.
8
9 HOWARD & HOWARD ATTORNEYS PLLC
10 /s/ Patrick M. McCarthy
11 Robert Hernquist
Nevada Bar No. 10616)
12 Wells Fargo Tower, Suite 1000
3800 Howard Hughes Pkwy.
13 Las Vegas, Nevada 89169
Telephone: (702) 257-1483
14 Facsimile: (702) 567-1568
Email: RHernquist@HowardandHoward.com
15
16 Patrick M. McCarthy (Michigan Bar No.
P49100) (admitted *Pro Hac Vice*)
One North Main Building, Suite 410
17 101 North Main Street
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104
18 Telephone: (734) 222-1483
Facsimile: (734) 761-5957
19 Email: PMcCarthy@HowardandHoward.com
20
21 Kristopher K. Hullibarger
(Michigan Bar No. P66903)
(admitted *pro hac vice*)
450 West Fourth Street
22 Royal Oak, Michigan 48067-2557
Telephone: (248) 723-0453
23 Fax: (248) 645-1568
Email: kkh@h2law.com
24
25
26
27 Attorneys for Plaintiff Konami Gaming, Inc.
28

4839-0215-1466, v. 1

Dated this 9th day of November, 2015.
HOLLAND & HART LLP
/s/ Robert C. Ryan
Robert C. Ryan, Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 7164
5441 Kietzke Lane, Second Floor
Reno, Nevada 89511
Telephone: (775) 327-3000
Facsimile: (775) 786-6179
Email: rryan@hollandhart.com

Ryan A. Loosvelt, Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 8550
9555 Hillwood Drive, 2nd Floor
Las Vegas, Nevada 89134
Telephone: (702) 669-4600
Facsimile: (702) 669-4650
Email: raloosvelt@hollandhart.com

Christopher B. Hadley, Esq.
(*Pro Hac Vice* to be filed)
222 South Main St., Suite 2200
Salt Lake City, UT 84101
Telephone: (801) 799-5873
Facsimile: (801) 618-4238
Email: cbhadley@hollandhart.com

Attorneys for Defendant PTT, LLC d/b/a
High 5 Games